



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/353,847	07/15/1999	HYUN CHANG LEE	8733/PD-6981	4171

30827 7590 11/14/2003

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

ANYASO, UCHENDU O

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2675

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2003

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/353,847

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Uchendu O Anyaso

Art Unit

2675

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-26.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


STEVEN SARAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Moon (U.S. Patent 5,793,346) remains silent as to any teaching or suggestion about the components of the gate on/off generator 50 as well as any teaching or suggestion as to whether the gate on/off generator 50 generates, for example a gate-off voltage upon applying the external power VDD. However, Moon teaches this concept of applying a gate-off voltage upon applying an external power VDD by teaching how the Node N1 shows a ground level 0V when external 5V power VDD is being supplied, while it shows (-5V), when the external power is shut off (see Moon at column 3, lines 39-42, figures 4 & 5). Furthermore, Moon teaches how this node N1 functions to turn off the transistors M1 which are connected to the gates lines. Specifically, Moon teaches that when the voltage level of node N1 is 0V, the gate-source voltage V_{gs} becomes greater than the threshold voltage V_{th} of the PMOS transistor M1 (column 3, lines 45-47). This causes this transistor M1 to be turned off (column 3, lines 47-48). Clearly, Moon teaches a mechanism of supplying a gate-off voltage upon applying an external VDD. Furthermore, Moon teaches how this aspect of the invention i.e., how the screen clearing circuit 40 is connected to gate-lines and the corresponding TFT transistors of the LCD display (see figure 4). Applicant has failed to distinguish his invention from Moon. Rather, applicant regurgitates his claims, then regurgitates Examiner's rejection, and then concludes that Moon fails to teach the elements of the claims without explaining or analyzing how applicant arrives at this conclusion. As such, after considering applicant's request for reconsideration, applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Hence, this application in its current form is not in condition for allowance.